

The Southern Standard.

W. D. CHAPMAN, Publisher and Proprietor.
J. R. SMITH, Editor.

ARTICLE XX.—The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.—Federal Constitution.

COLUMBUS:

Saturday Morning, February 28, 1852.

TO ADVERTISERS:

THE SOUTHERN STANDARD has a weekly circulation twice as large as any paper published in this city. It is therefore the cheapest channel through which to convey information to the masses. Merchants and traders will find it to their advantage to give us a call, if they desire general publicity.

There is the finest assortment of Job Type in this establishment ever brought to this city, and we can execute, on short notice, all orders for work in all branches of our business.

Columbus, Miss., Oct., 18th., 1851.

WE direct the attention of the reader to the communication of Tara, on our first page. Without intending to flatter our fair correspondent, we must be permitted to thank her for this paper—the conclusion we regard as worthy of great praise. It is hoped that she will continue to favor us with her contributions, the more frequent the better. She is setting an example to other young ladies of our city worthy of imitation—will they profit by it.

Faulding Clarion.

The paper above named has thought proper, for the playful manner in which we alluded to its editor not long since as an actor in the 8th of January convention, to read us a lecture. Always anxious to be instructed, we cannot resist an ardent wish to exhibit to those who undertake this labor of love our desire to return them our thanks in a public way. We are too indisposed now, laboring as we are under the effects of a severe cold, to do more than notice in a brief way, the points made by the *Clarion*, and shall reserve to another week, certain points we propose to make in defence of our present attitude. We really regard such defence unnecessary where the *Standard* is circulated; and if its course had not been either misunderstood or misrepresented in localities where it is not circulated, we should not be willing to waste our time by explanation. But the *Clarion* has done us manifest wrong; wrong as we will show, without a shadow of cause or fact to base its crimination upon. This being the case, we will now simply point to those statements of the *Clarion*, in which partial and absolute injustice has been attempted to be practiced on this press. In order to be distinctly understood, we number the paragraphs in the article from the *Clarion*, which we copy to-day, and without replying to them, we ask that the reader will note and retain them until we shall be in a condition to answer fully.

No. 1. It is admitted that we were too conscientious to say that the convention was "packed." The reader will notice that the *Clarion* has not said that the convention was not "packed." The *Clarion* dare not say it.

No. 2. It is not denied in this paragraph that a few "wire-workers" did pre-arrange the organization of the convention. Will it be denied?

No. 3. This paragraph contains one palpable misrepresentation, and the whole of it, so far as this misrepresentation is concerned, is misconceived, to speak in the mildest terms.

No. 4. We had no desire to question the motives of our contemporary in our late allusion to him, and we only intimate our opinion now, that he has mistaken us.

No. 5. Mr. Barry's resolution did not assert the right of secession.

No. 6. We understand this as admitting that secession is "an exploded issue." If it means not this, the whole paragraph is nonsense.

No. 7. This paragraph seems to indicate that all who do not endorse the action of the convention are favorable to a "third organization." As we are taunted with a desire to agitate, we understand that we are favorable to a "third party organization." This a great if not a ridiculous error.

No. 8. Are we to understand that we are one of the "ultra" men in the "management of the press," and are "very inconsistent" at that?

No. 9. The *Clarion* professes to be "practical," and speaks of that national "noble party" which has "done justice to the South." This is very fine but quite veridant.

These are the points we propose to comment on, & we shall very quietly and good naturedly stir up the editor of the *Clarion*. He has invited the discussion by putting us upon the defensive, having selected his own ground, and we hope he is possessed of too much manliness, to refuse to copy our full reply to his comments. We shall treat him kindly—believing him an excellent hearted gentleman, an ornament to the press, to society, and to the party to which he acknowledges allegiance.

Gen. Cass.

The gentleman whose name heads this article was, as all our readers well know, the candidate of the Democracy for the Presidency in 1848. The same gentleman is favorably mentioned by nearly all our Southern exchange papers in connexion with the same position, and it is not improbable that he may obtain the nomination of the Democratic National convention.—In view of this fact, we would like to obtain the distinct avowal whether certain presses in this State, in the event of his nomination by the Democracy of the nation, will sustain him. All are aware that a struggle is now going on in this State between the Foote democracy and Davis democracy, as to which are the better Democrats. This contest is amusing, and would be ridiculous, were it not that it has developed the approachable side of many important men in our State, proving that most men have their price, and that in order to obtain that price, they are neither choice nor particular in the use of means to secure it. It is hardly necessary for us to say, that as between the democracy of Foote and Davis there is but one opinion in the State. Foote is followed and bolstered up by a few old federal fogies, who have been favored by accidents, and the success which cunning, and frequently, duplicity brings. They have reaped rich harvests by claiming to be democrats but really entertained but a few general principles in common with the founder of that party. In regard to the rights of the States, they were wholly federal, and when that issue was presented, they naturally took shelter under the doctrine of the two Adams', and Alexander Hamilton.

On the other hand, the men who sustain Davis are the true strict constructionists, and belong to the party founded by Jefferson. They are as widely separated from the old true principles of Daniel Webster as they are from those of Foote and his democrats defend.—In regard to the rights of the States, Foote copies almost without alteration, the doctrines of Webster, and the State Rights men as wholly disavow them. This is the line of distinction.

Well, in regard to the pending contest, as to who shall be endorsed by the Northern National Democracy, there are two points over which we have had, and expect to continue to have, some sport. They are, in plain terms these: 1st. Will the Davis Democracy, or the Foote democracy, obtain seats in the Baltimore convention?

2nd. Will the Davis democracy sustain Gen. Cass, if he is the nominee. Cass belongs to the Foote democracy, is in fact a federal democrat; but he is not singular in that, for there is no doubt but that four-fifths of the Northern politicians are federalists. If the first point is left to the honesty of the convention it will be decided without debate; but as honesty of purpose has little control over such assemblages, it is probable that the Davis democracy will obtain seats. We say this, because it is known that Foote is really without a party in the State; because he cannot lead the federal whig party into a national democratic convention, and without them, he has but a few hundred miserable deluded followers. Davis numbers his by thousands, and the Northern democracy are less in the pursuit of principles than the spoils. Of course then, the Foote democracy will be kicked out of the convention.

In reference to the second point we halt. Two or more years since, we placed upon record our opinions in regard to Gen. Cass. It will stand as the record of our purpose without the least regard as to what the Baltimore convention may do. If Cass succeeds, the principles of Foote succeed. If Cass is the nominee, the Baltimore convention will be merely the organ of free-soil doctrine, such as all parties denounced in unmeasured terms in Mississippi in 1848. And in anticipation of the happening of such an event, we would like the press to speak out.

Would Davis, Barton, Whitfield, McWillie, Brown, Featherston, Gholson or McRea, support Cass were he the nominee? Would the Mississippian, the Sentinel, Free Trader or the Palladium sustain him? In our opinion the South has made but one step toward that awful dilemma events are hurrying her; and we say it more in sorrow than in anger, that our strongest men are doing much to urge her forward.

House of Representatives.

WEDNESDAY, Feb'y. 18, 1852.
The orders of the day, (bills from the Senate,) were taken up soon after the journal was read, and several local bills passed, heretofore noted in the proceedings of the Senate.

Mr. Stewart introduced the bill to change the mode of collecting taxes from pedlars in Marion county—passed.

ELECTION OF SENATORS.

At 12 o'clock the Senate enter the Hall of the House to proceed to the election of a Senator in place of H. S. Foote.

The President called the joint assemblage to order, and Mr. McAfee, of H., nominated Walker Brooke, of Holmes county.

Mr. Cook nominated N. S. Price, and proceeded to address the House amid (at first) great confusion, and cries of "order."

An excited debate ensued (which is noticed at length in another part of this paper.)

At 2 o'clock the two Houses took a recess.

3 O'CLOCK, P. M.

The joint convention again assembled, and the debate was resumed, in the course of which Mr. Keith nominated A. B. Bradford, of Marshall, Mr. Sharkey, W. A. Lake, of Warren, and Mr. Torrey, W. S. Wilson, of Claiborne.

The two Houses finally proceeded to vote: On the first voting 120 votes were given. Of these Mr. Brooke received 42 votes; Mr. A. G. Brown 12 votes; N. S. Price 11 votes; Mr. A. B. Bradford 9 votes; Mr. Jacob Thompson 5 votes; Mr. Wm. S. Wilson, 4 votes; Mr. McWillie 4 votes; Mr. Stephen Adams 4 votes; Mr. Reuben Davis 4 votes; Gen. Wm. R. Miles 2 votes; B. D. Nabors 2 votes; and 15 votes scattering.

No one of those named having received a majority of the whole number of votes cast, the convention proceeded to vote a second time.

The names of several gentlemen (who had been voted for they not being candidates) were here withdrawn.

We omit the second and third and proceed to give the

FOURTH AND LAST VOTING.

Whole number of votes given, 117.
Majority of the whole, 59.

Mr. Walker Brooke of Holmes county, received the following votes of

Senators.—Messrs. Adams, Alcorn, Farrar, Hemingway, Hussey, Nelson, Reynolds, and Tait—8.

Representatives.—Mr. Speaker, Messrs. Adams, Aldridge, Armistead, Barker, Benton, Bradford, Box, Catchings, Crusoe, Coopwood, Dubuison, Deavours, Daugharty, Gallant, Gillespie, Halford, Harper, Hemphill of Choctaw, Huntley, Jack, Jarnagin, Johnson, Jones, Pontotoc, Jones, of Kemper, Keith, Kennedy, Lackland, Likens, Marble, Matthews, McGuire, McInnis, Mitchell, Selser, Sims, Slack, Smith, Southworth, Sullivan, Tankersley, Taylor of Tishomingo, Terry, Vernon, West, White, Wilson and Wood—53.

Mr. N. S. Price of Tippah county received the following votes of

Senators.—Mr. President, Messrs. Beene, Bell, Bennett, Berry, Catchings, Drane, Golladay, Greer, Hough, Hughes, Pettus, Pope, Ramsey, Singleton, Stone, Taliaferro, Thompson—13.

Representatives.—Messrs. Barden, Brown, Byrum, Cooke, Gibbons, Hinds, Hodges, Martin, McCrory, McLaurin, Smyth, Thames, and Ward—13.

Mr. A. G. Brown of Copiah county, received the following votes of

Representatives.—Messrs. Bowman, Campbell, Chrisman, Dampier, Guy, Hathorn, McMillen, Parks and Sasser—10.

Mr. John J. McRea of Clark county, received the following votes of

Representatives.—Messrs. Jones of Jasper, Lewis, Seal of Harrison, and Stewart—4.

Mr. Wm. S. Wilson of Claiborne county, received the following votes of

Senators.—Messrs. Johnson and Torrey—2.

Representatives.—Mr. Pearce—1.

RECAPITULATION.

Mr. Walker Brooke, 61
" N. S. Price, 31
" A. G. Brown, 10
" John J. McRea, 4
" Wm. S. Wilson, 3
Scattering, 8

Total, 117 votes.

The President of the Senate announced that Mr. Walker Brooke having received a majority of the whole votes cast by this Legislature in Convention duly and constitutionally elected Senator in Congress, from the State of Mississippi, to fill the unexpired term of Hon. Henry S. Foote. The Convention adjourned.

THURSDAY, Feb'y. 18, 1852.

But little business was transacted in either House save the

ELECTION OF SENATOR.

in place of Jefferson Davis.

The two Houses assembled at 12 o'clock—the galleries were crowded, and on yesterday, and the galleries graced with an array of beautiful ladies.

The venerable President announced the object of assembling, and Messrs. Sullivan and Benton nominated Stephen Adams.

Mr. Bennett nominated John J. McRea.

Mr. Dougherty introduced a resolution propounding an interrogatory to Mr. Adams (in substance) whether he would vote for the nominees of the Whig National Convention, if more sound on the compromise than the nominees of the Democratic Convention?

An animated debate arose in which Messrs. Dougherty, Benton, Marble, Barry, Cook, Taylor, and others took part. Messrs. Keith and Cook, perpetrated sundry witticisms, to the apparent amusement of the members.

Without taking a vote on Mr. D.'s resolution, the two Houses proceeded to the election, which resulted—for

Stephen Adams, 66
John J. McRea, 47
Wm. S. Wilson, 2
A. M. Clayton, 1
Walker Brooke, 1

So Mr. Adams was elected.

All the Whigs and "Union" Democrats present (except Mr. Dougherty) voted for Adams, Mr. D. voted for Wilson.

Mr. Torrey voted for Wilson; Mr. Hinds for Brooke, with the explanation that he had declared his intention to vote for "the meanest and most ultra Whig in the State" in preference to Adams.

From the Pleading Clarion.

The "Southern Standard" and 8th of January Convention.

In our last issue, we intimated our intention of noticing at some length the studied misrepresentations, by the *Southern Standard*, at Columbus, of the action of the Democratic State Convention of the 8th of January.

The article of the *Standard* embraces a long editorial letter, carping and caustic, written with the usual ability of the editor, and dated at the "scene of action," the capital of the State, together with a very elaborate and somewhat lengthy introduction from the same pen.

We had particularly called upon to notice this ingenious, but somewhat Quixotic effort of our friend CHAPMAN, as personal and not very complimentary allusion is made to himself, as a member of the State Convention.

Our own course, as a journalist and as a Democrat, has been unvaryingly uniform; and being unconscious of important deviation from the principles of our party—including the strongest affirmation of the doctrines of States Rights—we feel that defence upon that point, even though attacked by so able a personage as our confederate of the *Southern Standard*, would be entirely a task of supererogation.

The argument of the *Standard* against the final action of the State Convention is ingenious, but manifestly *splendetic*. When our tripped penned his ironical letter, in which such huge but, we apprehend, *unfelt* blows are dealt against some of the most distinguished of Mississippi's sons, there was, it was clear, an unlooked for arrow in his heart—a blight of some darling anticipation—which so jounded his generally unfixed vision that he saw "treason" to principles in the purest impersonations of patriotism before him, and subservient in the loftiest independence.

Not a room or time for very extended comment, we leave the letter of the editor of the *Standard*, and go to its editorial *corroborations*, which is a synopsis and, in part, an elaboration of its points.

[1.] Mr. Chapman is conscientious enough not to say "that the Convention was 'packed,' but he goes into a process of argumentation which would leave that impression upon the minds of his readers. "Packed?" Yes, if the Legislature is packed—if any deliberative body exercising delegated authorities conferred by primary assemblages of the sovereign people, is packed, so was the Convention.

[2.] The next objection we find, is to the organization of the body. Judge ELLIS, the affable and efficient presiding officer, not being accustomed to extempore speaking, happened to read, from a manuscript in his hat, his brief and very good speech of thanks, in a manner which, Mr. C. says, would equal the courtly elegance of Lord Chesterfield, or be worthy the Court of a Charles, or a Louis; and from this fact, draws the inference, or at least intimates it strongly, that a few managers, wire-workers, pre-arranged the organization of the meeting. Suppose they did, what influence could that possibly have upon the future action of the body? A president is a mere parliamentary officer—"fixing" in the decorous language of the Editor of the *Standard*, necessary only to complete the organization of any public assembly. Judge Powhatan Ellis had long, during a series of preceding years, been honored with the compliment by the Democracy of the State, and it was deemed but justice to him, and a significant indication that we were the *old Democratic Party*, to place in the same position the man who presided over the assembled Representatives of Mississippi Democracy two years anterior, before the calamities of the political enemy, and the misconceptions of political friends, succeeded in riving assunder temporarily, the long victorious Democracy of this State.

[3.] But Mr. Chapman's great "point" against the 8th of January Convention, the allegation upon which the whole force of his logic depends, is, that Mr. ELLIS, of Claiborne, introduced a resolution referring to a Committee, to be appointed by the Chair, all resolutions presented, and devolving upon that Committee, the duty of reporting a series of resolutions for the action of the Convention. This, our very astute friend of the *Standard*, considers the "gag." By this resolution, he solemnly asserts, discussion was "stuffed." How preposterous! Discussion was, of course, deferred, and wisely; but we need not inform our readers, we need not remind our friend Chapman, whose prejudices have led him into so many ludicrous blunders, that the action of no committee is *fixed*—that its proceedings, in whatever form, must be decided by a majority of the sages of the Convention, and are open for parliamentary discussion. It was foreseen that many conflicting propositions would be before the Convention, as basis of action; that they would engender heated, protracted, and fruitless discussion; and hence the expediency, the propriety of referring all such propositions to a committee, who could calmly and reflectively digest them, and present them in one harmonious whole; to the consideration of the Convention. It was then the privilege of any person, being an authorized member of the body, to debate them—to propose modifications or move their rejection. And this is what Mr. Chapman calls "stiffing" discussion! Why, it is the almost invariable course of every deliberative body, nor does it take away or infringe upon any right.

The Editor of the *Standard* gives a hardly satisfactory compend of the speeches of gentlemen upon the resolutions of Mr. Hooker and the resolutions of Mr. Barry. It is singular, too, that while the speeches of gentlemen in support of the ultraisms of the *Standard*, were "powerful and pointed," eloquent and felicitous, the remarks of gentlemen in the opposition had neither "potency" (as Gov. Foote would say,) nor beauty! Fortunate indeed, Mr. Chapman, that all the talent and all the eloquence of the Convention, shed light upon your extreme positions!

[4.] During the debate upon Mr. Barry's resolutions, we are charged by the *Standard*, with being the most prominent among the "gaggers," because we moved to lay them on the table. And why did we do so? For the reason that we contended with Col. Jeff. Davis and Mr. Hooker, in the opinion that they were unnecessary—a mere elaboration of principles distinctly enunciated in the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions of '98 and '99, and always embodied in the emphatic resolves of each succeeding National Democratic Convention, since the party has had an existence. We desired to see the profitless discussion terminated; we wished to heal old breaches, not to create new ones in the republican ranks: such were our motives.

[5.] The resolutions of Mr. Barry asserted the right of secession, and declared the acknowledged truth, in explicit words, that the Federal Government has not the Constitutional right to coerce a sovereign State by its military power.—These were old principles of the Democratic creed, and their re-affirmation was entirely unnecessary. Besides, there was not, there is not, an issue before the people which would involve either of those principles. The sovereign voice has been heard through the ballot-box.

Why, then, will the *Standard* still agitate this question, settled by the decisive adjudication of the people?

[6.] Our position is simply this: The Democratic has always been the State Rights Party; to that Party we must henceforth look for a due regard of the rights of the States, as sovereigns, and a conservation of the Constitution. To make its great and vital principles effective in Mississippi, the re-union of the Democracy is essential. How can this be accomplished? Not by a contumacious adherence to an exploded issue; not by an impracticable spirit of adhesion, on the part of each and all, to their own prejudice and dogmas, but by oblivion of the unfortunate and ineffectual past, and by assuming our old and uniform position upon the resolutions of the Baltimore Convention. Thus we can aid in elevating to the Chief Executive station and duties a Democrat who will strictly construe, according to its letter and spirit, the federative organic law, and who, by an impartial administration, will restore, or at least, preserve from further disturbance that political equilibrium between North and South, which is the best guarantee of the permanency of the Union.

[7.] The point of order which was raised, and which caused the resolutions of Messrs. Barry and Fontaine to be ruled out, we voted for, and cast what we then and now consider an honest and a patriotic vote. They not only conflicted with the previous action of the Convention, which required that all resolutions "declaring principles" should be referred to the Committee of Fifteen, and that Committee having reported, and the result of their deliberations having been sanctioned by a large majority in full convention, we deemed it both unfair and unwise to change, alter, or modify what had been done. Independent of this, the Convention was authorized to perform but a few simple duties in its representative capacity, and these were, to appoint delegates to the National Democratic Convention, and to declare those great fundamental principles which had heretofore formed the platform of our party. We were charged by the people to do this, and nothing more, and after we had discharged this duty, our mission ended. The call for the Convention distinctly announced that all Democrats were invited to participate in its deliberations (without reference to our recent local divisions,) who believed in the old landmarks of the party. Under this invitation some twenty or thirty Union Democrats appeared as delegates, and shook hands with us as brothers, with the patriotic determination to let the past sink into oblivion. This course was based upon the primary action of the people, which was intended for a great and glorious purpose, the thorough and complete reorganization of the Democracy of the State. All reflecting and intelligent men well know that it is impossible to establish a permanent third party, based upon isolated questions; and, knowing this, what we would respectfully ask, is to be gained by keeping up perpetual agitation? Besides, did not every State Rights man in the last canvass announce repeatedly, after the sovereignty of the State had been invoked in reference to the pending questions between the State and Federal Government, that the decision of the people of Mississippi would be final, and must be acquiesced in by every good citizen. This was proclaimed from the stump by all our orators, and by every press in the State on our side. After the people have solemnly acted upon all the questions growing out of the legislation of Congress in reference to the institution of slavery, with what consistency can any State Rights man desire to reopen discussion upon settled questions. We believe the State of Mississippi has done wrong in denying her reserved sovereignty, and voluntarily surrendering herself into the hands of a majority of those who may, from time to time, control the Federal Government. But this is our simple opinion; and when you hear a Union man explain what he considers the "right of revolution," and the right which we claim of withdrawal from the Union, in the event of "intolerable oppression," the difference in our respective remedies, is about that between tweedledum and tweedledee. We contend that the separation may be, and of right ought to be, peaceable in its character, while our Union friend argues that in case of the withdrawal of a State from the Federal compact, the sword must be drawn and blood flow. In either event, should Congress unconstitutionally attempt to coerce a seceding State, the result would be precisely the same.

In closing this branch of the subject, we would remark, that should these questions ever again become practical ones, we will be found where we have always stood, and where every Democrat must always stand, who looks to the writings of Jefferson as the standard of his political faith.

In pursuing the course which we did in the Convention, we were actuated by no spirit of unkindness to the small, but noble and patriotic band of State Rights Whigs, who acted with us in the late canvass. They showed a moral heroism in separating from the great mass of their party upon what they regarded as vital principles, worthy the highest admiration, and we desire to do nothing which would hurt their feelings or place them in a wrong position. We feel well assured that both the old parties are about to be re-organized, and that the State Rights Whigs would remain with the Democratic Party, if that party considered the State Rights Party. They separated from their brother Whigs because they advocated the principles of Federalism and consolidation, and they can never consistently return to their original fold, until the present doctrines of their old associates are repudiated. This is not the case with the Union Democrats; they are bound in good faith hereafter to co-operate with us, because ours is the only Democratic organization extant in the State, and because we stand precisely where the national Democracy have always stood.

[8.] In this connection, and without the least feeling of unkindness, we feel bound to explain the causes which, in our humble opinion, contributed powerfully to the election of Gen. Foote.—To premise, we lay it down as an incontrovertible fact, that there is not a single public man in the State so odious to the masses of the people as Gen. Foote, which is demonstrated by his running about two thousand miles *behind* the other nominees on the Union State ticket! But the reader may ask us, how came Foote to be elected by a majority of 999 votes? We will explain: The Democratic party had several men connected with the management of the press, who were very ultra, and some of them very inconsistent in their course, and who occasionally published sentiments of an exciting and revolutionary character, which were well calculated to deceive and mislead the public mind as to our true intentions and objects in the future. This gave Foote, who is the most artful and unscrupulous demagogue in the Union, an opportunity and a pretext to *inflame* and *alarm* the minds of the people, and it was this temporary panic alone, which enabled him to slip into the Executive Chair by a lean majority. The Whig Party of East Mississippi voted for Foote for Governor, with very few exceptions, and there is not one man in fifty of them who have the least confidence in him, either as a man or a politician. They acted in a patriotic manner, because they considered (erroneously, we think,) that his election was necessary to secure the safety and peace of the country.

Such is the position which Foote occupies before the people of the State, and he knows it, and hence his feverish anxiety to force the present Legislature to re-elect him to the Senate for the long term. He well knows that if he is not re-elected now, that he is politically dead for all time to come. His pretence that he is an old Jackson Democrat, is the veriest humbug in the world.—This can be shown by a variety of proof. His associations in Jackson are mostly Whig, and nothing is truer than that "a man is known by the company he keeps." Himself and friends also make the compromise a test of their support of the Baltimore nominees, when it is well known that no new article of faith can be incorporated into the Democratic platform. The object of all this is, to keep up agitation, and give Foote a plausible excuse to Party, in the course of a few months! The transparent sophistry of his last political move at Washington has not deceived anybody; Downes, Houston, Douglass, and other Democratic leaders, all condemn his course.

If the Senate of this State consult the wishes of the people, they will not consent, at this session, to go into the election of Senator for the long term; and if Foote must leave his darling Mississippi, let him as Minister to Hayti, or some other foreign country. The people want him to serve out his full term for Governor; he is pledged to do so; and if we had the power we would make him faithfully redeem that pledge, solemnly made to the people. If he could be forced to stand up to the people in one instance, it might be the means of producing a reformation, and make an honest politician of him, if such a wonderful change is possible to be accomplished!

[9.] We have alleged, and truly, that the Democratic is the State Rights Party. In our Government, Democracy is incompatible with a denial of a State's plenary sovereignty, except so far as she has relinquished to a Grand Agent the exercise of some of its attributes. We are, therefore, a Democrat because a State Rights man—a State Rights man because a Democrat, and so with the great and patriotic party with which we have the honor and the pleasure to act. The voice of our State has spoken against the exercise of the extreme right of secession, as a remedy for grievances not acknowledged to have been inflicted. We have expressed hitherto, our entire acquiescence in the popular will, and we now reiterate the expression. We have no desire to argue abstract principles, having no present and little chance of future application, like our theoretical Columbus contemporary. We come at once to the practical; we give heart and hand to the sustenance of that noble party which has always, as a national organization, done justice to the south, and adhered to the Constitutional compact. In that party is our future hope for the perpetuity of a co-equal Union. Why, does not the *Standard* know that even Martin Van Buren, while the abolitionism with which he has since so disgracefully affiliated? Is not its editor also aware that the "sage of Kinderhook" or Lindenwald, in affiliating with free-soil dissolved the ties that linked him with Democracy, and has not since been recognised, even by Northern Democratic statesmen, as within the fold of our political faith?

We might multiply argument *ad infinitum*, for the benefit of our Columbus friend, but we are conscious that, in his present perverse mood, it would be a thankless task. He wishes a new political organization, despite the adverse popular decision: we do not. For that purpose, with the two sanguine hope of accomplishing that end, he attended the State Convention, not as a democrat, but as an abstractionist—a theorist—an impracticable ultra—a non-descript. Finding no countenance for his political transcendentalism, he sat down, in a fit of chagrin, and wrote that remarkable editorial epistle. He returned to his sanctum, and, unfortunately, the *spelen* returned with him, and he penned that strangely capacious and sophisticated leucuration whose fallacies it has been our endeavor to expose, in a kindly spirit.

This Column is exclusively under the control of the Sons of Temperance.

THE MAINE LIQUOR LAW.—It is said that since the Liquor Law went into operation in Portland, crime, as decreased in that city seventy per cent.

The above, clipped from a northern exchange, shows the good effects which the passage of the Maine liquor law has upon the suppression of crime. To diminish crime is one of the first duties of our legislators and Magistracy, and it seems wise to us that this legislative reform was produced in our sister State, by skillfully removing the cause of crime, instead of rigidly punishing the offender. We presume that our readers will remember that the Maine Law, as one of its great features authorized the destruction of all liquor publicly offered for sale. And as the officers of the law have vigorously performed their duty, we have one pleasant result of its efficacy laid before us in the above extract. Where liquor is vendible crime exists, and it therefore becomes imperative duty of legislators, civil officers, and good citizens to attempt to put down this villainous traffic, not only waste property, ruins industry, but frequently brings to a dishonorable grave its deluded votaries.—*Star*.

A YANKEE TRICK.—Uncle Eb, as we used to call him, among those of his good qualities, had a failing. He did love good liquor, but such was the state of his credit that no one would trust him. He therefore, one day resolved to a trick, to answer the great desire of his appetite. He took two case bottles, put a quart of water into one of them, then put a bottle in each pocket, and started for the store.

"I'll take a quart of your rum," said Uncle Eb, as he placed the empty bottle on the counter. The rum was put up, and the bottle replaced in his pocket, when Uncle Eb, pulled from his purse what at a distance might seem to be a quart of a dollar.

"This is nothing but tin, Uncle Eb," said the trader.

"Eh now, it's a quarter," said Uncle Eb.

"It's tin," said the trader, "I shant take it."

"It's all I've got."

"Very well, then you can't have the rum."

Uncle Eb, without much demurring, pulled from his pocket the quart of water. The trader took it, poured it into his rum barrel, and off walked Uncle Eb, chuckling.

THE DRINK! THE DRINK! THE DRINK!—Some time since, a kind and affectionate father, but a wretched inebriate, not far from this vicinity, returning home from the coffee house, in a state of terrible intoxication, was met at the door by his little daughter, a lovely child of three years old, in the spirit of drunkenness, he lost his balance, and fell upon it. A horrid scream from the little girl brought the mother to the spot, who discovered, as soon as the poor drunkard had recovered himself, that its back was broken! He had broken the back of his child! The little girl lingered a few days in great agony, and then expired.

In the lunatic asylum of a neighboring State, not long since, might have been seen a man of singular melancholy in his madness, and whose replies to all questions were, "The Drink! The Drink! The Drink! The Drink!"

Question.—Who killed the child, and drove the father mad?

Answer.—He who furnished the intoxicating draught.

try. Such is the position which Foote occupies before the people of the State, and he knows it, and hence his feverish anxiety to force the present Legislature to re-elect him to the Senate for the long term. He well knows that if he is not re-elected now, that he is politically dead for all time to come. His pretence that he is an old Jackson Democrat, is the veriest humbug in the world.—This can be shown by a variety of proof. His associations in Jackson are mostly Whig, and nothing is truer than that "a man is known by the company he keeps." Himself and friends also make the compromise a test of their support of the Baltimore nominees, when it is well known that no new article of faith can be incorporated into the Democratic platform. The object of all this is, to keep up agitation, and give Foote a plausible excuse to Party, in the course of a few months! The transparent sophistry of his last political move at Washington has not deceived anybody; Downes, Houston, Douglass, and other Democratic leaders, all condemn his course.

If the Senate of this State consult the wishes of the people, they will not consent, at this session, to go into the election of Senator for the long term; and if Foote must leave his darling Mississippi, let him as Minister to Hayti, or some other foreign country. The people want him to serve out his full term for Governor; he is pledged to do so; and if we had the power we would make him faithfully redeem that pledge, solemnly made to the people. If he could be forced to stand up to the people in one instance, it might be the means of producing a reformation, and make an honest politician of him, if such a wonderful change is possible to be accomplished!

[9.] We have alleged, and truly,